

Social and Economic Equity (SEE) Program Area

Report to the Board of Governors

Brent Herbert-Copley

Director

Program and Partnership Branch

October 2003

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms

Executive Summary

1. Background and Context

- 1.1 Why Social and Economic Equity?
- 1.2 The Program Area at a Glance
- 1.3 Program Evolution

2. Review of Current Activities

- 2.1 Program Initiatives
 - 2.1.1 Governance, Equity and Health (GEH)
 - 2.1.2 Micro Impacts of Macroeconomic and Adjustment Policies (MIMAP)
 - 2.1.3 Peacebuilding and Reconstruction (PBR)
 - 2.1.4 Trade, Employment and Competitiveness (TEC)
- 2.2 Secretariats
 - 2.2.1 Environment and Economy Program for South-East Asia (EEPSEA)
 - 2.2.2 Research for International Tobacco Control (RITC)
 - 2.2.3 Secretariat for Institutional Support for Economic Research in Africa (SISERA)
- 2.3 Corporate Projects
 - 2.3.1 Consortium for Economic and Social Research, Peru (CIES)
 - 2.3.2 Small and Medium Enterprise Policy Development Project, Egypt (SMEPol)
 - 2.3.3 Tanzania Essential Health Interventions Project (TEHIP)

3. Corporate Learning: Strengthening Indigenous Capacity

4. Conclusion: The Way Forward

5. Annexes

- A** – Micro Impacts of Macroeconomic and Adjustment Policies (MIMAP)
- B** – Peacebuilding and Reconstruction (PBR)
- C** – Trade, Employment and Competitiveness (TEC)
- D** – Governance, Equity and Health (GEH)
- E** – Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA)
- F** – Research for International Tobacco Control (RITC)
- G** – Secretariat For Institutional Support for Economic Research in Africa (SISERA)
- H** – Economic and Social Research Consortium (Peru)
- I** – Small and Medium Enterprise Policies for Development (SMEPOL)
- J** – Tanzania Essential Health Interventions Project (TEHIP)

List of Acronyms

CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CIES	Consortium for Economic and Social Research, Peru
CIHR	Canadian Institutes for Health Research
CSPF	Corporate Strategy and Programming Framework
DFID	Department for International Development
DPA	Director of Program Area
EEPSEA	Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia
ENRM	Environment and Natural Resource Management
ERF	Economic Research Forum
FCTC	Framework Convention on Tobacco Control
FTE	Full time equivalents
GEH	Governance, Equity and Health
GFGI	Global Financial Governance Initiative
ICT4D	Information and Communication Technologies for Development
IDEP	Institute for Economic Development and Planning
ITC	Information and Communication Technologies
LAC	Latin America and Caribbean
LACRO	Latin America and Caribbean Regional Office
MIMAP	Micro Impacts of Macroeconomic and Adjustment Policies
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PBR	Peacebuilding and Reconstruction
PI	Program Initiative
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
RITC	Research for International Tobacco Control
ROCARE	Réseau Ouest et Centre Africain de Recherche en Education
SDC	Swiss Development Cooperation Agency
Sida	Swedish Development Cooperation Agency
SISERA	Secretariat for Institutional Support for Economic Research in Africa
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
SMEPol	Small and Medium Enterprise Policy Development Project, Egypt
TEC	Trade, Employment and Competitiveness
TEHIP	Tanzania Essential Health Interventions Project
WIDER	World Institute for Development Economics Research
WTO	World Trade Organization

Executive Summary

Over the past several years, the development community has focused renewed attention on issues of poverty and social equity. IDRC's Social and Economic Equity (SEE) Program Area is both a reflection of and a response to this shift.

Thematically, IDRC's Social and Economic Equity (SEE) Program Area comprises a series of Program Initiatives, Secretariats and Corporate Projects which together focus on critical issues in social and economic policy. Running through the Program Area is a concern with the role of public policy in reducing poverty and enhancing social equity. Programming units with SEE work to enhance understanding of the distributional consequences of policy choices, and to explore policies which can build the foundations of longer-term "pro-poor" growth and competitiveness.

Structurally, the Program Area continues to evolve along the lines outlined in the last report to the Board two years ago. In particular, this involves:

- A gradual move toward larger, globally-based program initiatives;
- Consolidation of the SEE programming map through the devolution of key activities and the cultivation of links between Corporate Projects, Secretariats and Program Initiatives; and
- Improved depth and regional representation.

This report provides a summary of the current status and recent accomplishments of each of the constituent elements of the SEE Program Area.

A particular concern of the report is that of strengthening indigenous research capacity. The report stresses the importance of long-term capacity-building as a central element in any strategy to influence public policy through research. Recent evaluations by the Centre, however, have stressed the complexity of capacity-building, and the need for persistence and patience in capacity-building efforts. The report profiles some recent examples of SEE activities dealing with individual and institutional capacity-building, with the creation of intermediary institutions, and with the promotion of networking and Canadian linkages.

Overall, the SEE Program Area is well positioned as the Centre begins to develop its next Corporate Strategy and Program Framework. The Program Area is targeting a set of critical issues in the promotion of more equitable development strategies, and the constituent units of SEE are well-managed, appropriately-resourced, and can demonstrate positive results.

At the same time, exploration of potential new program themes – such as private sector development and education – continues. The Program Area is also working to improve the efficiency of our internal operations, to build linkages with the other program areas, and to continue efforts at fostering donor and Canadian partnerships.

1. Background and Context

1.1 Why Social and Economic Equity?

Over the past several years, the development community has focused renewed attention on issues of poverty and social equity. Nancy Birdsall and Augusto de la Torre have gone so far as to argue that “Poverty reduction and equity have come to dominate the development agenda – displacing but not eliminating growth”. More recently, José Antonio Ocampo (ex-Secretary General of the UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, and new UN Under-Secretary General for Economic and Social Affairs) has pointed to “growing awareness of the need for integrated policy frameworks in which social objectives really stand at the center of economic policy”.

IDRC’s Social and Economic Equity (SEE) Program Area is both a reflection of and a response to this shift. It comprises a series of Program Initiatives, Secretariats and Corporate Projects which together focus on critical issues in social and economic policy. Running through the Program Area is a concern with the role of public policy in reducing poverty and enhancing social equity. Programming units with SEE work to enhance understanding of the distributional consequences of policy choices, and to explore policies which can build the foundations of longer-term “pro-poor” growth and competitiveness.

The emphasis on equity is deliberate. SEE starts from the premise that poverty reduction cannot be achieved without addressing issues of distribution, of fairness, and of social justice – both in the management of social and economic policy within countries, and in the relations among countries in the global economy. This in turn implies a strong focus on the institutions – formal structures, laws, norms and customs – that mediate between policies and individuals. As the World Bank notes in its 2003 World Development Report, biased institutions result in unequal and inequitable policy outcomes – but are also themselves frequently a product of the political disenfranchisement that accompanies social inequity.

SEE’s activities are explicitly focused on informing and influencing public policy. But the units which comprise the Program Area take a long-term view of the process of policy change. Direct policy-related research is balanced with efforts to build indigenous research capacity (see Section 3 below). The Program Area also strives to balance two different but ultimately complementary approaches to linking research and public policy. On the one hand, Program Initiatives, Secretariats and Corporate projects frequently support research conducted from a “policy advice” stance, in which researchers target particular policy issues and debates and work to generate findings which can directly influence the content and orientation of government policy. Equally importantly, however, much of the work in the Program Area starts from what might best be labeled a “public accountability” stance – in which the primary focus of research is to inform public debate and enable civil society organizations to engage in discussion with public sector officials about critical policy issues. Together, these three strands of SEE work – capacity-building, policy advice and public accountability – represent the cornerstones of our approach to long-term policy influence.

1.2 The Program Area at a Glance

SEE is a program **area**, not a tightly defined program itself. As such, there is a considerable amount of heterogeneity in the individual programming units within SEE. Decision-making, moreover, is decentralized to the level of program teams, providing them with flexibility to define their own work programs and respond to emerging opportunities.

Nonetheless, there is a strong substantive link among the constituent units of SEE. At the risk of oversimplification, each of the four SEE Program Initiatives deals with a central determinant of poverty and equity within and between countries:

- Globalization and the integration of developing countries in the world trading system – via Trade, Employment and Competitiveness (TEC)
- National economic policy frameworks – via Micro Impacts of Macroeconomic and Adjustment Policies (MIMAP)
- Conflict and post-conflict reconstruction – via Peacebuilding and Reconstruction (PBR)
- Access to key social services – via Governance, Equity and Health (GEH).

In addition to these program initiatives, SEE comprises a set of six Secretariats and Corporate Projects, which support capacity-building and policy-related research at the national, regional and international level. Secretariats and Corporate Projects are managed by IDRC and funded jointly by IDRC and other donor agencies. They target specific gaps in existing capacity and/or specific opportunities for policy influence, ranging from environmental economics in Asia to health sector reform in Tanzania. As such, their subject matter is diverse and frequently cuts across more than one PI. Current initiatives are:

- Environmental Economics Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA)
- Research for International Tobacco Control (RITC)
- Secretariat for Institutional Support to Economics Research in Africa (SISERA)
- Economic Research Consortium for Economic and Social Research, Peru (CIES)
- Tanzania Essential Health Interventions Program (TEHIP)
- Small and Medium Enterprise Policy Development Project, Egypt (SMEPol).

The following table provides a brief overview of the current SEE Program Area.

Table 1: The SEE Program Area, 2003/04				
Unit	Geographic Focus	Current Funding Period	Staffing (Full-time equivalents, program staff only)	Annual Budget, 2003/04*
Program Initiatives				
GEH	Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean	2002-2006	3.7	\$3.3 m
MIMAP	Sub-Saharan Africa, Middle East and North Africa, Asia	2000-2005	4.1	\$5.5 m
PBR	Global	2000-2005	5.0	\$4.4m
TEC	Global	2000-2005	4.7	\$5.5m
Secretariats				
EEPSEA	Asia	2003-2007	1.6	\$1.7m
RITC	Global	2002-2005	2.0	\$1.1m
SISERA	Sub-Saharan Africa	2003-2007	3.0	\$3.7m
Corporate Projects				
TEHIP	Tanzania	1997-2004	2.0	\$1.2m
CIES	Peru	1999-2004	0.5	\$0.9m
SMEPol	Egypt	2000-2005	1.5	\$1.4m
* Budget figures for Program Initiatives refer to IDRC funding only; in the case of Secretariats and Corporate Projects, this includes IDRC and other donor funding.				

These programming units are complemented by funds disbursed by the Regional Activity Funds (RAF) managed by each IDRC Regional Office, and by the central Forward Planning fund. These funds provide increased flexibility to the Centre to support small activities of regional priority, to explore potential new program directions, and to provide support to projects which are beyond the scope of individual programming units. Thus, for example, over the past year RAF funds have supported a consultation in Cairo on potential research issues in the field of private sector development. The Centre-wide Forward Planning fund, meanwhile, has provided a \$1 million contribution to an endowment fund established by the African Economic Research Consortium (AERC).

1.3 Program Evolution

At least four broad contextual factors set the parameters within which SEE activities are unfolding. In each of these areas, there is continuity with issues raised at the time of the last DPA reports in October 2001. But there has also been change – often gradual and evolutionary, but at times more abrupt and disruptive.

- The rise of a new security agenda – and the increasing militarization of security issues and debates – in the wake of the 9/11 tragedy.
- A new trade round, which has highlighted the interpenetration of trade and domestic economic and social policy, as well as the highly contentious nature of many aspects of the current WTO agenda.
- The continued shift in emphasis within the development community to issues of poverty, as the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) process continues to advance, and as increasing numbers of donors restructure their programs to put poverty reduction front and centre.
- Worsening levels of poverty and income distribution throughout much of the developing world, encompassing not only HIV/AIDS-ravaged central and southern Africa, but also Latin America and parts of Asia.

Each of these developments underscores the program choices made by the Centre to date. At the same time, they raise a series of new challenges and opportunities. Section 2 of this report discusses current activities within SEE, and highlights ways in which the Program Area is responding to these and other developments.

Structurally, the SEE Program Area has continued to evolve along the lines envisioned at the time of the last report to the Board. Three areas of evolution are important in this regard

- **a gradual move toward larger, globally-based program initiatives.** With the approval of the GEH Program Initiative by the Board of Governors in October 2002, SEE now has four well-established program initiatives. In each case, the subject matter of the PI's is inherently global. PBR has taken cautious steps to begin developing an Asian sub-program, with the commissioning of exploratory studies, the launch of initial project activity in Sri Lanka, and a PI team meeting in India. GEH and MIMAP have likewise signaled their interest in "going global", with resource constraints being the main barrier. As IDRC's overall budget increases in coming years, I anticipate a scenario in which each PI is global in scope (but where programs are regionally tailored) and where each manages a budget of between \$5 and \$10 million annually, with a program staff complement of 4-6 FTEs per PI.
- **consolidation of the SEE programming "map".** At the start of the current CSPF period, SEE consisted of a wide and at times confusing range of funding windows. Over the past few years, the management of several activities has been devolved to partner institutions (e.g., the Trade and Industrial Policy Secretariat, in South Africa), with future funding consolidated in the hands of existing Program Initiatives. This

process is continuing, with both SISERA and the Peru Consortium to be devolved over the next 12-18 months, and with ongoing efforts to build links between Corporate Projects and relevant PIs (e.g., TEHIP and GEH; SMEPol and TEC). The result should be a simpler, more streamlined program structure, which will facilitate management and exploit synergies among individual activities. At the same time, devolution is providing opportunities to strengthen the capacity of key partner agencies not simply to carry out research, but also to coordinate research programs and manage multi-donor funding.

- **Improved program “depth” and regional representation.** The last DPA report to the Board underscored the need for increased depth in the human resources available to support SEE programming. Particularly given the move toward global Program Initiatives, regional representation is critical to ensure that global programs can be sufficiently responsive to the needs of particular regions. There has been significant progress on this front over the past year, with recruitment of new SEE staff for the Singapore and Delhi offices, and with redeployment of existing positions to ensure that all PIs have an effective staff presence at head office and in the regions where they are active. Even so, human resources remain stretched, and as will be discussed later a key issue is how to ensure effective management of increasing program budgets within the constraints of existing staffing levels.

2. Review of Current Activities

This section of the report provides a brief overview of the principal activities of individual SEE programming units. The emphasis is on activities undertaken over the past 12-18 months, although in some cases reference is also made to ongoing program activities.

2.1 Program Initiatives

2.1.1 Governance, Equity and Health (GEH)

Governance, Equity and Health (GEH) is the newest SEE Program Initiative, its Prospectus having been approved by the Board of Governors in October 2002. GEH is the product of exploratory activities supported by the Centre to define entry points for research support in the area of governance. This process recommended that IDRC concentrate on issues relating to the management of social services, with a particular emphasis on health and health care services. GEH focuses in particular on Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean – although it also provides support to one project in the Indian state of Kerala (jointly funded with MIMAP) and may over time evolve to a global status.

Given the fledgling status of GEH, a central priority is team-building. A team meeting was held in South Africa in January 2003, attended by the full IDRC team as well as representatives of most of the institutions currently receiving support from IDRC. A new Senior Program Specialist began work at the IDRC head office in September 2003, and the increasing involvement of LACRO program staff has helped to build an incipient portfolio of activities in

the LAC region. The GEH team remains relatively small, although this is offset somewhat by an innovative partnership with the Swiss Development Cooperation Agency (SDC) which involves not only a core contribution to GEH over a four-year period, but also direct involvement of SDC staff as part of the larger GEH team.

As its name suggests, GEH is concerned with equity of access to health and health care services, and with the politics of health service design and delivery. In both of these areas, a key issue is the ability of developing country researchers and decision-makers to draw on results of research and experimentation around the world, and to synthesize existing knowledge as a basis for policy recommendations. GEH is examining the possibility of creating a platform to support this kind of work, currently dubbed “GEH Research Matters”. Initial consultancies are underway to define the scope and possible modalities of such an initiative, as a basis for ongoing funding over the coming fiscal year.

2.1.2 Micro Impacts of Macroeconomic and Adjustment Policies (MIMAP)

Box 1: Devolving Programming Responsibility to Partner Institutions: The Poverty and Economic Policy Networks

At the centre of MIMAP are three networks, dealing respectively with poverty measurement and analysis, with modeling and impact assessment of particular policies, and with community-based approaches to poverty monitoring. A key initiative over the past year has been the devolution of management responsibility for these networks to partner agencies in Canada (Laval University) and the Philippines (Angelo King Institute). These so-called “Poverty and Economic Policy” (PEP) networks are now fully operational, with partner institutions responsible for the administration of network meetings and competitive grant programs. MIMAP staff continue to provide overall guidance and technical assistance to the networks, and have worked with the Centre’s Grants Administration Department to strengthen partners’ capacities for independent grant-making. Over time, MIMAP expects this process to continue, with management of the networks passing entirely to Southern partners.

MIMAP is in many respects the prototype IDRC program initiative, having been established in 1990 as a stand-alone project in the Philippines and gradually expanding to encompass a wide range of single-country studies and thematic networks. MIMAP focuses on understanding the distributional impacts of economic policies – initially focusing on macroeconomic adjustment policies, but now increasingly turning its attention to broader economic policy including public sector expenditure. It is critically concerned with the ways in which changes at the “macro” level are transmitted to the level of households and individuals, and the frequently unequal impacts of policy on particular social groups (men and women, poorer and less-poor, rural and urban, young and old, etc).

MIMAP has been among the leaders in advancing understanding of the nature of poverty in developing countries, and the complex transmission channels between the macro-economy and the household. It has

stressed the need for multi-faceted definitions of poverty, integrating not only income and consumption measures, but also more qualitative assessments of capabilities and well-being. It has also worked to advance modeling techniques, among other things by integrating issues of intra-household distribution into policy impact analyses.

As the international community turns increasingly to poverty reduction as the central concern of development policy, MIMAP is well-placed to capitalize on its past investments. Several MIMAP partners (notably in Bangladesh, Vietnam and Sénégal) have been directly involved in the process of drafting national Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers. Over the past year, MIMAP staff have worked with CIDA and the World Bank Institute on a three-year, \$5.2 million dollar program in West Africa to support poverty analysis and monitoring of PRSP implementation. This program, provides not only additional resources for research support, but also a critical opportunity for independent poverty analysis units supported by MIMAP to directly interact with decision-makers.

MIMAP has also made a dedicated effort to improve the dissemination of the results of research it supports, and to synthesize research findings. A summary volume on MIMAP activities to date is in preparation, to be published as part of IDRC's "In_Focus" series. A book summarizing MIMAP-funded work on gender budgets (authored by Naila Kabeer) has been published and was launched at events in New York and Ottawa. And MIMAP team members have been increasingly active in presenting the results of MIMAP-supported research at a variety of forums, including the annual OECD Forum and the World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER) conference in Helsinki.

Limited human resources have been an ongoing issue for MIMAP. This has eased somewhat, with the addition of part-time program staff in Singapore (January 2003), Ottawa (September 2003) and Delhi (October 2003). This, combined with the devolution of management of the PEP networks, should allow MIMAP to cope with a rising budget over the coming few years. A transition in team leadership has just been completed, and the MIMAP team as whole is larger, more regionally-based, and more multi-disciplinary than in the past.

2.1.3 Peacebuilding and Reconstruction (PBR)

The Peacebuilding and Reconstruction (PBR) program initiative supports research to understand and contribute to the process of long-term peacebuilding in conflict and post-conflict situations in the developing world. Its program has traditionally been focused on a small number of countries and regions where conflict and the transition to peace is at the centre of the development agenda – the Middle East (primarily Palestine); Central America (with a particular focus on Guatemala); Colombia; and Southern Africa.

PBR has gone through a significant transition over the past two years. The entire PBR team has changed since the approval of the PI prospectus in October 2000, with most of the current team members having joined the Centre within the past two years. The process of transition continues, with new program staff recently hired (or about to join) in Delhi and Cairo, and with another Ottawa-based senior program specialist currently on parental leave. Previously a predominantly Ottawa-based team, the PBR team is now much more regionally disbursed, with program staff not only in Ottawa but also in four of the Centre's six regional offices.

Despite staff changes, programming has continued apace. Particularly noteworthy here has been the Central American portfolio, where PBR-supported studies on issues such as land reform policy are generating interest in the run-up to elections in Guatemala this fall. PBR has

also taken steps to explore emerging issues in the peacebuilding field, including collaboration with the ICT4D program area and a visiting research scholar (Rafal Rozhinski) to examine the links between information and communications technologies and peacebuilding, and the ways in which ICTs are being used in conflict and post-conflict situations.

PBR has taken advantage of the staff transition to undertake a series of consultations over the past year. Scoping studies are underway to define options for programming in Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia, and the PI has convened a series of workshops to consider global programming opportunities (dealing, for example, with issues of gender and peacebuilding, and with the links between globalization and peace). One conclusion emerging from these consultations has been the need for additional cross-country case study research. Two projects are being launched in this regard. One, a six-country network coordinated by the North South Institute, will examine factors of success and failure in peace processes in specific war-torn contexts. The other is comparing gender and women's political participation in Afghanistan and northern Uganda /southern Sudan.

The other broad contextual factor affecting PBR has been the changed security environment in the wake of the September 11, 2001 attacks and the subsequent military campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq. The impact on peacebuilding research has been ambiguous. While on the one hand heightened security concerns are resulting in renewed emphasis on conflict and post-conflict situations, they also tend to focus attention on military conceptions of security, rather than the broader process of re-building war-torn countries and regions which is at the heart of PBR's concerns. The unresolved Israeli-Palestine conflict has also had a major impact on PBR. PBR maintains an active program in Palestine, but in the absence of meaningful progress toward a negotiated settlement, the program is increasingly oriented to sustaining independent research groups as a contribution to long-term peacebuilding, and to producing research with a long "shelf-life" for future rounds of Israeli-Palestinian negotiations.

2.1.4 Trade, Employment and Competitiveness (TEC)

At the time of drafting of this report, the world community was preparing for the September 2003 Cancun Ministerial meeting of the World Trade Organization (WTO), a major milestone in terms of progress toward the successful completion of the so-called Doha or "development round" of WTO talks. This event underscores the importance for the Centre of a program of research on trade and international economic relations, and provides the background for the work of the Trade, Employment and Competitiveness (TEC) program initiative.

TEC is a mature PI, and with an annual budget of \$5.5 million is one of the largest of the Centre's program initiatives. It is managed by a multi-disciplinary team of experts located in Ottawa and at five of the Centre's six regional offices. The PI supports a number of ongoing regional trade research networks, as well as national projects and thematic networks dealing with particular issues in the integration of developing countries into the world trade system.

The WTO agenda is a major influence on the work program of TEC. The Doha round has witnessed the introduction of a new set of “behind the border” concerns into trade negotiations, in the form of the so-called “Singapore issues” (government procurement; trade facilitation; investment; and competition policy). These are critical issues, but raise particular challenges for already-stretched developing country negotiators, particularly given the lack of credible analysis of the implications of agreements on these issues for individual developing countries. TEC has been one of the first funders to devote significant attention to these issues, with a series of projects examining trade and competition policy issues. On another front, TEC is

supporting a project to examine experiences with WTO accession – where the increasingly stringent commitments required for accession are a particular barrier for less-developed countries hoping to join the WTO, and where analysis of past experiences may provide guidance to prospective members. TEC has also begun to examine – along with the Rockefeller and Hewlett foundations in the US – the prospects for advance on issues of agricultural tariffs and subsidies, which remains perhaps the key negotiating issue from a development perspective. And in conjunction with GEH, TEC has launched a series of projects looking at the issue of trade in health services, where new international agreements may have significant impacts on the functioning of health systems in the South.

TEC-supported work has also underlined the tight connections between trade and financial integration in the current world economy. The first phase of the TEC-supported “Global Financial Governance Initiative” (GFGI) is just wrapping up, and the PI is discussing possible follow-on activities dealing with reform of the institutions of international economic coordination.

2.2 Secretariats

2.2.1 Economy and Environment Program for South-East Asia (EEPSEA)

Over the course of the past ten years, the Economy and Environment Program for South-East Asia (EEPSEA) has supported training and capacity-building in the field of environmental economics in ten countries, ranging from China and the Philippines to Cambodia and Laos. As a multi-donor-financed Secretariat, EEPSEA has enjoyed the support of a number of donor agencies, with ongoing core support not only from IDRC, but also at present from CIDA and the Swedish Development Cooperation Agency (Sida). Changing donor priorities have

Box 2: Fostering Regional Trade Research Networks

One key element in the strategy of TEC has been the establishment of regional and sub-regional networks that bring together leading trade economists to work on issues of common concern. The Latin American Trade Network (LATN) is the longest-standing such initiative. LATN involves researchers from throughout the region for collaborative research and outreach activities, and has attracted additional support from the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, Ford Foundation and others. TEC’s experience suggests that such networks can be particularly effective where capacity is dispersed but research priorities are shared. Similar networks have been established by TEC in Central America, and most recently in Southern Africa – in both cases focusing particular attention on regional integration issues.

resulted in the departure of some early donors to EEPSEA, but the program continues to enjoy a stable base of long-term funding.

EEPSEA's approach to capacity-building combines small research grants; networking and peer review of proposals and reports; regional training courses on specific topics and techniques; and access to literature and outside resource persons. It is an approach that has yielded not only a cadre of trained environmental economists in the region, but also concrete policy influence, ranging from electricity pricing reform in Vietnam to timber permits in Sri Lanka. Based on the success of EEPSEA, the Centre has begun to explore the possibility of similar endeavours in other regions, notably southern Africa.

2.2.2 Research for International Tobacco Control (RITC)

Research for International Tobacco Control is an international secretariat managed by IDRC from its Ottawa headquarters. Despite a relatively small staff and budget, RITC has developed a reputation as a leading source of support for research on tobacco control policy issues in developing countries. RITC focuses on tobacco as a development issue broadly defined – looking not only at health-related issues, but also at the economics of tobacco control, at legislative options and models, at the environmental impacts of tobacco cultivation, and at alternative crops and livelihood options for tobacco farmers.

IDRC renewed its funding to RITC in April 2002. Since that time, the successful negotiation of the UN Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) has raised awareness of the tobacco epidemic, and opened new possibilities for RITC (see Box 3). RITC has taken action over the past year to position itself as a major player in the coordination of tobacco control research, notably via a workshop co-sponsored with the Rockefeller Foundation in Ottawa in November 2002. It has also supported two high-profile publications – the first a series of country case studies of the development of tobacco control policies; and the second a review of existing studies on the economic impacts of tobacco.

Immediate priorities for RITC are the completion of an external evaluation (slated for late 2003-early 2004) and renewed efforts to expand the funding base for RITC activities beyond current support from IDRC, CIDA and Health Canada.

Box 3: The Framework Convention on Tobacco Control

In May of this year, negotiations were completed for the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC), the first-ever UN convention dealing with a health issue. The convention includes a series of commitments in terms of tobacco control policies, ranging from advertising to educational programs. The FCTC represents a major step forward in terms of tobacco control, but also a major challenge in terms of capacity-building for developing country governments seeking to ratify and implement the convention. RITC has responded with plans for a new initiative to support background research and capacity-building to assist selected countries as they prepare for implementation, and is negotiating with other donors regarding support for this effort.

2.2.3 Secretariat for Institutional Support for Economic Research in Africa (SISERA)

Originally founded in 1997, SISERA has played an active role over the past six years in providing integrated support to strengthen promising economic policy research institutions in Sub-Saharan Africa. Operating from a base in Dakar, SISERA is managed by a small secretariat team and enjoys funding from IDRC, USAID, the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the European Union.

SISERA currently works with 17 institutions in 16 Sub-Saharan African countries, aiming to develop strong research institutions which can play an active role in influencing economic policy in the region. It provides not only financial support, but also technical support to strengthen management of recipient institutions. It is also working to improve linkages among research centres in the region, and between research institutions and policy-makers. SISERA partners in several countries (notably Uganda and Senegal) have been actively involved in the development of national PRSPs in recent years.

SISERA has itself been undergoing a process of “institutional development” over the past year, with active negotiations to transfer the management of the Secretariat to IDEP, a specialized develop policy institute which reports to the UN’s Economic Commission for Africa. Plans for the full devolution of SISERA activities should be completed over the coming few months.

2.3 Corporate Projects

2.3.1 Consortium for Economic and Social Research, Peru (CIES)

The Consortium for Economic and Social Research (known by its Spanish acronym, CIES) is an umbrella organization with some 30 members representing major social and economic research groups throughout Peru. With core funding from CIDA and IDRC, CIES manages an annual research competition, a series of training and capacity-building workshops for less experienced researchers (notably those from provincial universities outside Lima) and a program of publications and dissemination events. A major concentration of CIES over the past year has been to improve linkages between the research community and government officials, through briefings, workshops, and most recently an electronic bulletin summarizing key research findings. A notable success has been the decision by the Peruvian Central Bank to adopt a macroeconomic planning model developed by Consortium-supported researchers in collaboration with officials of the Bank of Canada. Improved policy linkages, in turn, are resulting in a stronger financial base for CIES, with both the Central Bank and the Ministry of Economy and Finance turning to CIES to manage research activities over the past year.

A central aspect of current CIDA-IDRC support has been to solidify the position of CIES as an effective intermediary institution supporting social and economic policy research throughout Peru. A new institutional development strategy and fundraising plan have been developed, and CIES has enjoyed success in attracting project-based funding from Ford Foundation, DFID, World Bank, USAID, MacArthur Foundation, and several Peruvian government agencies. Management and corporate governance have also been strengthened, and CIDA and IDRC are

currently negotiating a new four-year program of support in which management of donor funds will be devolved entirely to CIES.

2.3.2 Small and Medium Enterprise Policy Development Project, Egypt (SMEPol)

Issues of employment creation via the small enterprise sector are an essential part of the development agenda in Egypt, where levels of unemployment particularly among youth are extremely high and where the traditional solutions of large firm and public sector employment cannot match growth in the labour force. In this context, CIDA and IDRC have for several years collaborated with the Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Trade in a program to help buttress the Ministry's role in fostering new policy interventions to stimulate the growth of small and medium-sized firms.

The SMEPol project has worked to strengthen research and policy analysis capability within the Ministry, to forge links with the domestic research community and to foster greater inter-Ministerial cooperation in policy development and implementation.

The project has enjoyed success in spearheading the adoption of a unified definition of SMEs (a critical step in policy coordination), and has developed proposals for action on regulatory reform and government procurement. Priorities for the coming year include improvements in the availability of data to support SME policy interventions, as well as the development of strategies for action on SME financing and export promotion.

2.3.3 Tanzania Essential Health Interventions Program (TEHIP)

Box 4: Building Capacity for Decentralized Health Planning in Tanzania

Decentralization of government service delivery can result in better targeting of expenditures – but only if local communities and decision-makers have accurate and convincing information on local needs. In Tanzania, the IDRC-managed TEHIP program has developed a series of decision-making tools that allow district-level health officials to better understand the burden of disease facing their district, and the way in which existing financial and human resources are deployed. As TEHIP moves into its final phases, the emphasis has shifted to training and capacity-development. Thus, for example, a training workshop in October 2002 introduced officials from six districts to the District Health Accounts tool, which provides a summary and graphic analysis of annual health budgets. As these decision-making tools are rolled out on a national level, the Ministry of Health is also strengthening mechanisms for “community voice” to promote greater community ownership of health-service resources.

Over the past year, TEHIP has garnered well-deserved attention as a significant IDRC success story. Press coverage (including a high-profile article in *The Economist*) has highlighted the success of TEHIP in demonstrating how better evidence on the actual burden of disease can enable better targeting of health expenditures and improvements in health status – even in the absence of significant increases in health spending.

TEHIP itself is coming to a close, and IDRC has allocated an additional \$1.5 million (on top of existing CIDA and IDRC funding) to facilitate the wrap-up of project activities and to develop plans for possible follow-on activities. Two such activities are of particular importance: on the one hand, the “roll-out” of decision-making tools and approaches developed by TEHIP at a national level,

by strengthening the network of zonal health training centres in Tanzania; and, second, development of plans for a possible “research to policy” institution, which could assist African health sector officials by synthesizing the results of existing research and providing access to relevant research findings from around the world. Initial consultancies have been commissioned to advance planning on both fronts.

3. Corporate Learning: Strengthening Indigenous Capacity

As noted in the opening section of this report, strengthening local research capacity is a central goal of the Centre and of the SEE program area. Given the long-term, uncertain nature of policy change in any society, efforts to foster and reinforce local capacity are an essential element in a strategy to influence public policy through research (see Box 5).

Box 5: Capacity-Building and Policy Influence: IDRC’s Experience in Vietnam

A recent study of IDRC’s economics-related programs in Vietnam, carried out as part of the broader policy influence evaluation coordinated by the Evaluation Unit, has underscored the way in which long-term capacity-building can contribute to influencing public policy. The report notes the success of IDRC’s approach to long-term policy influence in Vietnam, which involved “a combination of capacity building, institutional development, and network creation/maintenance. One of its essential requirements, if it is to be successful, is a patient and steadfast orientation to the long term which allows the sustained application of financial and human resources over several years and refuses to be discouraged by initial confusion or flailing around, by recurrent delays, and by the absence of immediate breakthrough results” (André Saumier, “The Impact of Research on Public Policy: IDRC’s Programs in Vietnam”, 2003).

At the same time, IDRC’s experience over the past 30 years illustrates the complexity of capacity-building. Persistence, flexibility and learning are all essential ingredients in strategy of capacity-building. And just as clearly, efforts to strengthen local capacity can be frustrated by pressure for immediate, visible results; by frequent and abrupt shifts in funding priorities; by rigid institutional procedures on the part of funders; and by problems of coordination among donor agencies.

The paragraphs which follow provide some recent examples of capacity-building initiatives within SEE, organized in terms of four broad aspects of our current capacity-building efforts: strengthening individual research skills; fostering institutional capacity; creating and sustaining effective intermediary institutions; and promoting networking and Canadian collaboration. They also highlight some of the issues that will need to be addressed by the Centre in the upcoming corporate evaluation dealing with capacity-building.

Strengthening individual research skills. Much of the support provided by SEE programming units is geared to strengthening the capabilities of individual researchers – through small grants programs, training opportunities, and collaboration between younger and more experienced researchers. Experience has also demonstrated, however, that a variety of other elements need to be in place for local research capacity to flourish.

One such element is access to literature. Access to the latest technical literature is a persistent problem for developing country researchers, given the funding crisis facing public universities and research centers and the increasing costs of journal subscriptions. Over the past two years, SEE Program Initiatives (MIMAP, TEC and more recently GEH and PBR) have worked with the Centre's library to develop and pilot a program to provide on-line access to leading academic journals for individuals and institutions currently receiving IDRC funding. The initiative provides funding for a group license agreement, under which IDRC recipients are provided with password-protected access to a suite of specialized journals – on the same terms as IDRC staff. Full-text versions of many journals are available on-line, and IDRC library staff offer document delivery services in instances where full-text versions are not available or where connectivity presents a barrier to accessing full-text versions. The Centre is currently in the process of expanding this program to provide a similar service to recipients of all IDRC Program Initiatives.

Fostering institutional capacity. IDRC's funding is overwhelmingly geared to specific research projects, rather than to "bricks and mortar" institution-building. Efforts are made to ensure that research projects contribute to institutional development – through support to dissemination efforts, for example, or training workshops for partners on issues of grant management or fund-raising. But institutional capacity-development is generally an indirect outcome of project-based support.

An exception to the general pattern of IDRC support is the Secretariat for Institutional Support for Economic Research in Africa (SISERA), which was created to fill an acknowledged gap in economics funding in Sub-Saharan Africa. While existing programs like the African Economic Research Consortium provide support to individual researchers, there are few programs to strengthen institutions as a whole. SISERA provides both seed and program grants to key institutions, as well as technical support to improve the administrative and managerial capacity of recipients. Even in the case of SISERA, however, grants are relatively small in terms of the overall needs of institutions. Targeted support, along with technical assistance from IDRC staff and promotion of networking with other institutions, remains the hallmark of IDRC's approach.

Creating and sustaining intermediary institutions. IDRC has also worked to build capacity by fostering the growth of intermediary institutions which themselves serve to build research capacity and channel resources to research. In the Middle East, for example, IDRC was a founding donor of the Economic Research Forum for the Arab Countries, Iran and Turkey (ERF). The Centre has funded a number of specific projects managed by the ERF, and recently approved a contribution to an endowment fund established by the ERF. Other examples include the African Economic Research Consortium (AERC) and the Peruvian Consortium for Economic and Social Research (CIES) described earlier in this report.

In the case of the Peru Consortium, the need to strengthen the capacity of weaker institutions outside Lima has meant a change in strategy over time. In addition to its central role in managing competitive grants programs, the Consortium is devoting increased attention to training programs for provincial university faculty members, and to the promotion of

collaborative research involving stronger and weaker centres. A partnership with the Peruvian government statistical agency is also improving access to statistical databases.

Networking and Canadian collaboration. As noted earlier in this report, promotion of networks is often a central part of IDRC's approach to capacity-building. Networks frequently play the role of "institutional surrogates", helping to reduce the isolation of individual researchers working in specialized fields. Past IDRC evaluations have pointed out, however, that a critical challenge is to ensure that networks buttress rather than displace existing institutional capacity.

Similar issues arise in terms of Canadian partnerships. Links with Canadian researchers may be particularly important in new research fields such as peacebuilding, where few southern research institutions have a strong track record. Canadian partnerships may also serve to expand the resource base for development research. Thus, for example, GEH has entered into a partnership with other Canadian funding agencies (CIDA, Health Canada and the Canadian Institutes for Health Research) to support global health research by teams of Canadian and developing country researchers. A total of 71 proposals were received as a result of the initial request for proposals, and planning grants have been awarded to 27 teams. GEH is providing additional resources – in collaboration with CIHR – to fund three collaborative projects in which southern research partners play the lead role.

4. Conclusion: The Way Forward

As earlier sections of this report have indicated, the SEE Program Area is well-positioned as the Centre begins to develop its next Corporate Strategy and Program Framework. The Program Area is targeting a set of critical issues in the promotion of more equitable development strategies, and the constituent units of SEE are well-managed, appropriately-resourced, and can demonstrate positive results.

At the same time, we continue to examine new issues and new opportunities for IDRC research support, particularly in the context of the coming CS+PF. One such issue is that of private sector development. Fostering entrepreneurship and supporting the growth of smaller firms is a critical element in promoting the creation of new jobs – which in turn are central to any long-term strategy for poverty reduction and reduced inequality. Yet entrepreneurs in developing countries frequently face a confusing and almost byzantine regulatory environment, in which barriers to the creation, growth and exit of firms abound.

Recognizing these issues, the Centre recently supported a consultative meeting in Cairo to examine research issues related to the "enabling environment" for private sector development, with a particular focus on the Middle East and North Africa region. The workshop brought together IDRC staff and experts from within and outside the region for a two-day examination of policy experiences and possible research entry points. The preliminary conclusion emerging from this meeting was that many – although not all – of the key issues could be addressed by existing IDRC programming units (notably TEC and the Gender Unit). Discussions on this

and other issues will continue over the coming months as the Centre moves forward with the development of its planning framework for the next five-year period.

Similar issues arise regarding the field of education research. While recognizing the central importance of education policy to development prospects around the world, SEE has taken a cautious approach to this issue. The Centre has recently approved two special projects – one to provide support to the Association of African Universities, and another to the West African education research network ROCARE – in part to allow us to maintain a “watching brief” on education issues. Similarly, the GEH Prospectus explicitly mentions the possibility of expanding the PI to deal with education and other areas of social service delivery down the road. But, as with the issue of private sector development, any decisions in this regard will have to reflect the need to balance new opportunities against constraints on the Centre’s human and financial resources.

This raises a broader issue of concern to all programming units within SEE. As the Centre moves (we continue to hope) toward higher levels of program appropriations with little or no growth in staff strength, programming units must develop ways of efficiently managing larger program portfolios. This means careful attention to team decision-making processes, efficient support from other parts of the Centre, and efforts to move toward larger, longer-term projects which can reduce the transactions costs of grant-making. The challenge, of course, is to achieve this shift while maintaining the distinctive features of IDRC’s mode of operation – responsiveness, regional tailoring, and close interaction between IDRC staff and partners in the field.

Three other issues bear mentioning in terms of future directions for SEE. The first of these is linkages with the other IDRC program areas. Preliminary steps have been taken in this direction with work by MIMAP on the links between poverty and ICTs (including a high-level workshop held in September this year, in Boston), and the efforts of PBR and ICT4D to begin exploring issues related to ICTs and peacebuilding. Other opportunities exist as well (between TEC and ENRM on agricultural trade; between EEPSEA and ENRM on valuation methods; between RITC and ENRM on the environmental impacts of tobacco) and will be encouraged over the coming months and years.

A second issue concerns resource expansion. The news here is mostly positive, with all programming units now giving serious consideration to partnerships with other donors as part of their normal work planning. Over time, we aim to develop longer-term partnerships with a few key donors, as opposed to relatively transaction-heavy negotiations regarding specific activities. GEH’s partnership with SDC represents one model, but equally the recent MIMAP-CIDA partnership in West Africa, or TEC’s efforts to engage with US foundations on trade and agriculture issues, are worthy of mention.

Finally, SEE programming units will continue to devote resources to sustaining and expanding linkages with Canadian government departments and agencies, as part of our effort to be a vital part of the Canadian foreign policy family. By their very nature, SEE units deal with issues of policy concern to Canada as well as developing countries, and the Program Area will increasingly work to develop strategies for partnership around key events like the WTO

ministerial meeting or the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) negotiations. Our goal is both to raise the visibility of IDRC and its partners, and also to play an independent but helpful role in supporting Canadian foreign policy goals.

Micro Impacts of Macroeconomic and Adjustment Policies (MIMAP)

Team Leader Luc Savard	Approved Budget 2003-2004: \$5,500,000	Full-time Equivalents: 4.4
----------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

Type	Name	Discipline	Time allocated	Location
Team Leader	Luc Savard	Devpmt. Economics	100%	WARO
Program Officer	Anyck Dauphin	Micro-Economics	80%	Ottawa
Program Officer	Evan Due	Intl. Devpmt./Public Policy	30%	ASRO
Program Officer	Vacant		20%	ESARO
Program Officer	Randy Spence	Public Fin./Macro-Econ.	70%	London
Program Officer	Navsharan Singh	Political Science/Economy	60%	SARO
Program Officer	Sharmila Mhatre	Health Policy/Public Policy	30%	Ottawa
Research Officer	Martha Melesse	BusAdmin/Int.Dev't Coop.	50%	Ottawa

The MIMAP program assists developing countries build the knowledge base to measure and analyze poverty as well as design policies and programs that meet economic stabilization targets while alleviating poverty and reducing vulnerability. The program has established a series of Poverty and Economic Policy Networks that connect developing-country researchers, policy officials, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and international experts. Through research, training, and dialogue, these networks work to increase knowledge of the human costs of macroeconomic policies and shocks; improve policies and programs to alleviate poverty and increase equity; and press for their consideration and implementation at the sub-national, national, and international levels. The network includes more than 40 research teams from Asia, Africa, and Canada.

The objectives of the Program are:

- To enhance the research capacity of developing countries to analyze the impact of macroeconomic policies on their citizens.
- To provide new instruments for policy and program design and analysis by developing rigorous analytical tools and poverty monitoring systems.
- To assist the development of community-based monitoring and local development mechanisms.
- To strengthen the ability of policymakers to negotiate with international players, such as the international financial institutions and other multilateral and bilateral organizations.
- To bring together researchers, politicians, government officials, and NGOs in policy dialogue at the national and regional levels.
- To promote the exchange of research knowledge, tools, results, and policy measures among countries, institutions, and donors.

Peacebuilding and Reconstruction (PBR)

Team Leader Pamela Scholey	Approved Budget 2003-2004: \$4,400,000	Full-time Equivalents: 5.0
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

Type	Name	Discipline	Time Allocated	Location
Team Leader	Pamela Scholey	Polit. Economy/Anthropol.	100%	Ottawa
Program Officer	Colleen Duggan	Intl. HR. Law/Dev. Law	80%	Ottawa
Program Officer	Wachira Maina	Law	80%	ESARO
Program Officer	Moussa Samb	Political Science	20%	WARO
Program Office	Gerd	Political Science	80%	Ottawa
Program Officer	Schonwalder*	Political Science/Economy	40%	SARO
Program Officer	Navsharan Singh		50%	MERO
Research Officer	Vacant	Eng./French Literature	50%	Ottawa
	Eileen Alma			

**** G. Schonwalder will be on parental leave from August '03 to April '04. Gerett Rusnak will replace him during his absence.***

Peacebuilding is the pursuit of policies, programs and initiatives that seek to create the conditions for war-torn countries to transform or manage their conflicts without violence in order to address long-term developmental goals. The PI's mission is to support knowledge generation, policy development and research capacity building as tools to assist war-torn societies in their transition to peace and sustainable development. The PBR PI aims to actively help Southern countries that are emerging from conflict to avoid relapse into violence, by supporting research on and for peacebuilding processes. Through a range of projects, comparative analyses, and collaborative initiatives, PBR hopes to contribute to the emergence of innovative and strategic spaces for peacebuilding research, policy, and action.

The objectives of the Program are:

- To enhance knowledge and understanding of three key aspects of post-war transitions: democratization, human security and the political economy of peacebuilding.
- To contribute to research capacity building, policy development and institutional arrangements that support transitions from violent conflict to peace and sustainable development at the local, national, regional or international levels.
- To promote innovative thinking and strategies for sustainable peace through historical and critical analysis of the nature, dynamics and impacts of current peacebuilding agendas.
- To encourage the development of new research methodologies, approaches, tools and partnerships in support of peacebuilding.

Trade, Employment and Competitiveness (TEC)

Team Leader Susan Joeques	Approved Budget 2003-2004: \$5,500,000	Full-time Equivalents: 4.7
-------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

Type	Name	Discipline	Time Allocated	Location
Team Leader	Susan Joeques	Socio-economics	100%	Paris
Program Officer	Anyck Dauphin	Economics	20%	Ottawa
Program Officer	Evan Due	Economics	70%	ASRO
Program Officer	ElWathig Kameir	Sociology	50%	MERO
Program Officer	Vacant	Economics	80%	ESARO
Program Officer	Andres Rius	Economics	80%	LACRO
Program Officer	Gerd	Political Science	20%	Ottawa
Research Officer	Schonwalder*	Economics/Dev. Studies	50%	Ottawa
	Gerett Rusnak			

** G. Schonwalder will be on parental leave from August '03 to April '04. Gerett Rusnak will replace him during his absence. Gerett's position will also be filled during that period.*

The Trade, Employment and Competitiveness program initiative supports research geared to enabling developing countries to participate more effectively in multilateral and regional trade negotiations, and to understand the impact of trade policy decisions on national competitiveness and employment creation, and the interaction between trade and domestic policy measures. This entails attention not only to "traditional" trade policy issues, but also to the increasing range of new trade-related issues, which have emerged in the WTO and other international negotiating fora. To date, projects pursued or being developed under TEC have been of three types. A first set of activities has focused on emerging issues in international trade relations such as labour standards, the environment, investment codes, and trade in services. A second set of activities focuses on domestic and regional policy responses to globalization. Finally, the initiative is supporting a number of networks of economists in Africa and Latin America that include trade among their major preoccupations.

The objectives of the Program are:

- To improve developing countries' negotiation and bargaining capacities.
- To contribute to the design of instruments, processes and procedures that will allow developing countries to better profit from global opportunities.
- To assist developing countries to promote coherence between their domestic economic policies and their international trade policies.

Governance, Equity and Health (GEH)

Team Leader Christina Zarowsky	Approved Budget 2003-2004: \$3,300,000	Full-time Equivalents: 3.7
--	--	--------------------------------------

Type	Name	Discipline	Time Alloc.	Location
Team Leader	Christina Zarowsky	Medical Anth./Physician/Pub.Health	100%	Ottawa
Program Officer	Roberto Bazzani	Medicine, Pub.Health & H.Systems	30%	LACRO
Program Officer	Jean-Michel Labatut	Development Sociology	30%	Ottawa
Program Officer	Andres Rius	Economics	20%	LACRO
Program Officer	Moussa Samb	Law and Political Science	70%	WARO
Program Officer	Sharmila Mhatre	Community Health/Econ.&P.Health	70%	Ottawa
Research Officer	Martha Melesse	Bus.Admin. / Int.Dev. Coop.	50%	Ottawa

The Governance, Equity, and Health Program (GEH) supports the dual goals of promoting equitable outcomes in health and promoting inclusion and effective citizenship. GEH aims to build an interconnected body of research approaches, findings, networks, and research-to-policy-to-practice linkages that will promote well-being in both its "technical" (sector specific) and sociopolitical dimensions. GEH programming seeks to help developing countries address three fundamental and interrelated needs:

- improved health care using the very limited resources available;
- accountability and citizen participation in building a viable society;
- inclusion of relevant experience into the policy process so that governments and managers are able to make decisions based on evidence.

The objectives of the Program are:

- To support applied research that will both strengthen and monitor the capacity of governments to ensure equitable financing and delivery of priority public health and health care services, especially to marginalized and underserved populations.
- To support informed and effective citizen demand and participation throughout the policy-to-practice process.
- To increase the effectiveness of research-to-policy linkages in promoting the dual goals of health and social equity.

Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA)

Executive Director	Current IDRC funding (2003-04 to 2006-07)	Total IDRC funding to date	Total Co-funding to date	Full Time Equivalents
David Glover	\$3,200,000	\$6,930,000	\$12,200,000	1.6

Type	Name	Discipline	Time Allocated	Location
Executive Director	David Glover	Economics	100%	ASRO
Deputy Director	Hermi Francisco	Economics	60%	Philippines

EEPSEA supports training and research in environmental and resource economics. The program uses a networking approach to provide, not only financial support, but meetings, resource persons, access to literature, publication outlets, and opportunities for comparative research across its ten member countries (Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Vietnam, Cambodia, Lao PDR, China, Papua New Guinea and Sri Lanka).

The objective of the Secretariat is:

- To strengthen local capacity for the economic analysis of environmental problems so that researchers can provide sound advice to policy-makers.

Research for International Tobacco Control (RITC)

Executive Director	Current IDRC funding (2002-03 to 2004-05)	Total IDRC funding to date	Total Co-funding to date:	Full Time Equivalents
Linda Waverley	\$1,200,000	\$ 4,195,602	\$2,623,780	3

Type	Name	Discipline	Time Allocated	Location
Executive Director	Linda Waverley	Experimental Medicine	100%	Ottawa
Senior Program Specialist	Karen Madden	Human Kinetics	100%	Ottawa
Research Officer/Coordinator	Rosemary Kennedy	Social Sciences	100%	Ottawa

The mission of the Research for International Tobacco Control Secretariat is to create a strong research, funding and knowledge base for the development of effective tobacco control policies and programs that will minimize the threat of tobacco production and consumption to health and human development in developing countries. RITC works to accomplish this mission through a combination of research, dissemination, strengthening of capacity and coordination.

The objectives of the Secretariat are:

- To provide technical and financial support for multi-disciplinary, policy-relevant international tobacco control research.
- To strengthen individual and institutional capacity for tobacco control research in developing countries.
- To advocate for research related to both the production and consumption of tobacco in developing countries.
- To catalyze financial, intellectual, and technical support for tobacco control research in developing countries.

Secretariat for Institutional Support for Economic Research in Africa (SISERA)

Executive Director Elias Ayuk (Acting)	Current IDRC funding (2003-04 to 2006-07) \$2,400,000	Total IDRC funding to date (since FY 97/98) \$5,220,000	Total Co-funding to date \$7,335,361	Full Time Equivalents 3
Type	Name	Discipline	Time Allocated	Location
Acting Executive Director	Elias Ayuk	Economics	100%	WARO
Senior Program Specialist	Elias Ayuk	Economics	100%	WARO
Senior Program Officer	Basil Jones	Economics	100%	WARO

SISERA was created in July 1997 to provide technical and financial support to African economic research institutions. It currently works with 17 institutions in 16 sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) countries. SISERA's mission is to facilitate or to catalyze the emergence of centres of excellence for economic research in SSA and to assist them to play a more effective role in the policy making process. It is expected that ultimately this will lead to enhancing the effectiveness of the macroeconomic policy environment in the sub-continent.

SISERA undertakes program activities in three main areas. These include (i) institutional strengthening, which involves the provision of financial support in the form of core and seed grants, providing technical support to collaborating centres, training researchers, and enhancing the managerial capacity of research centres; (ii) linking up researchers and end-users and; (iii) networking of African research centres.

Networking is a major highlight of SISERA's interventions. Through this, the Secretariat seeks to mitigate the isolation of African economic research centres, pool their human resources and allow them to implement research agendas that address supra-national issues. SISERA has created two sub-regional policy research networks: one for Southern and Eastern Africa (SEAPREN) and the other for Western and Central Africa (WECAPREN). The two networks will play a crucial role in the flow of information to policy-makers and to individual researchers, especially on research that is geared towards responding to the challenges of regional integration and NEPAD, and of attaining the objectives of the Millennium Development Goals.

The objectives of the Secretariat are:

- *To strengthen economic research institutions, building and utilizing existing capacities.*
- *To forge links between researchers and key policy stakeholders.*
- *To develop networks of economic research institutions.*
- *To improve the Secretariat's internal effectiveness and coordinate donor support for economic research in SSA.*

Economic and Social Research Consortium (Peru)

Responsible Officer	Current IDRC funding	Total IDRC funding to date	Approximate Co-funding to date	Full Time Equivalents
Brent Herbert-Copley	\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000	\$3,900,000	0.6

Type	Name	Discipline	Time Allocated	Location
Responsible Officer	Brent Herbert-Copley	Political Science	10%	Ottawa
Research Officer	Geret Rusnak	Economics/Dev. Studies	50%	Ottawa

The Economic and Social Research Consortium (known by its Spanish acronym, CIES) is a private umbrella organization. Its mission is to contribute to Peru's development by raising the level of national debate on key options for economic and social policy. CIES has been operating under a grant from the Canadian International Development Agency and the International Development Research Centre, since April 1999. It succeeds the Peru Economic Research Consortium, a grouping of five economic research centers, which was supported by CIDA and IDRC between 1989 and 1999. In addition to this core support, CIES manages projects supported by Peru's public sector and a growing range of donors. CIES has a strong comparative advantage for organizing programs of applied policy research, and is increasingly recognized as a convener of informed, plural debate among the research community, policy-makers and civil society.

The objectives of the Project are:

- To produce knowledge that is useful for analyzing, designing, executing, and evaluating government policies and programs on economic and social issues.
- To improve the quality and relevance of research.
- To strengthen and decentralize capacity for research and teaching.
- To foster debate among academia, government, and civil society.
- To promote recognition of, and support to, social and economic research in Peru.

Small and Medium Enterprise Policies for Development (SMEPOL)

Responsible Officer	Current IDRC funding	Total IDRC funding to date	Approximate Co-funding to date	Full Time Equivalents
E. Rached	NA	\$500,000	\$5,500,000	1.5

Type	Name	Discipline	Time Allocated	Location
Coordinator	Greg Goodwin	Economics/Business	100%	MERO
Program Officer	ElWathig Kameir	Sociology	50%	MERO

Micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) are seen as critical to dealing with the employment challenge facing Egypt over the coming years. But while a variety of MSME promotion programs are in place with support from government, NGOs, and donor agencies, the overall policy environment for MSME development in Egypt remains weak and chaotic as a result, in part, of decades of large-scale, state-sponsored industrialization efforts. The project is aligned with IDRC's broader priorities for the Middle East-North Africa region. The project supports Egypt's transition to a market economy by assisting the Government of Egypt to improve the policy environment for MSME development.

The objectives of the Project are:

- To develop MSMEs policies, legislation and regulations.
- To provide training and technical assistance to upgrade and maintain the human and institutional capacities of the Ministry of Foreign Trade.
- To improve, through research, the knowledge and information base available to the Ministry, to enable evidence-based policy development.
- To develop collaborative relationships between the Ministry and stakeholders, and to raise awareness of SME related issues.

Tanzania Essential Health Interventions Project (TEHIP)

Responsible Officer	Current IDRC funding	Total IDRC funding to date	Approximate Co-funding to date	Full Time Equivalents
Constance Freeman	\$1,500,000	\$6,300,000	\$15,100,000	2.0

Type	Name	Discipline	Time Allocated	Location
Project Manager	Graham Reid	Health	100%	Dar es Salaam
Research Manager	Don de Savigny	Health	100%	Switzerland/London

The Tanzania Essential Health Intervention Project (TEHIP) tests the impact of efficient delivery of selected, prioritized essential health interventions on population health status. TEHIP is a collaborative project between IDRC and the Tanzanian Ministry of Health. TEHIP tests innovations in planning, priority setting and resource allocation in the context of decentralization of the health system.

The Project has entered into a final "Exit Strategy" phase following a period of seven years of designing and testing specific tools and supportive strategies that promote and improve evidence-based planning and essential health intervention delivery by health management teams, within a decentralized setting. This phase is geared to strengthen Tanzanian institutional systems to support the national roll-out of TEHIP products, as well as to potentially influence other countries in the region/continent to consider the inclusion of TEHIP products into ongoing health sector reform activities.

The objectives of the Project are:

- To determine how and to what extent district health planning can be more evidence based.
- To explore issues of implementation of evidence-based district health plans.
- To assess the impact on population health of such planning interventions.